

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH
CENTRAL DIVISION

JAY PETERSON,
Plaintiff,

vs.

HERSCHEL J. SAPERSTEIN, et al.,
Defendants.

MEMORANDUM DECISION AND
ORDER ON PENDING MOTIONS

Case No. 2:05-CV-900 TS

This matter is before the Court on several motions recently filed by Plaintiff after the dismissal of his Complaint and the close of this case. On May 17, 2006, the Court entered a Memorandum Decision and Order Granting Defendants' Motion to Dismiss, Disposing of Remaining Motions and Closing Case.¹ Thereafter, unabated, Peterson filed the following: Plaintiff's Motion for Extension of Time to Respond to Motion to Strike,² Plaintiff's Motion to

¹ Docket No. 23.

² Docket No. 24, filed May 22, 2006.

Amend Complaint,³ Rule 59 Motion to Alter or Amend a Judgment,⁴ and Motion for Expedited Discovery.⁵

With the exception of Plaintiff's Rule 59 Motion to Alter or Amend a Judgment,⁶ these pleadings are inappropriate, as the case has been dismissed. The Court will deny these motions. However, it will allow briefing on the Rule 59 Motion and will issue a ruling on the merits.

Based upon the above, it is hereby

ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Extension of Time to Respond to Motion to Strike (Docket No. 24) is DENIED. It is further

ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion to Amend Complaint (Docket No. 25) is DENIED. It is further

ORDERED that the parties shall fully brief Plaintiff's Rule 59 Motion to Alter or Amend a Judgment. It is further

ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Expedited Discovery (Docket No. 31) is DENIED.

³ Docket No. 25, filed May 22, 2006.

⁴ Docket No. 29, filed May 30, 2006.


⁵ Docket No. 31, filed May 30, 2006.

⁶ Docket No. 29.

SO ORDERED.

DATED June 6, 2006.

BY THE COURT:



TED STEWART
United States District Judge